



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,238	03/01/2002	Yoneichi Ikeda	8305-217US (NP127-1)	4274

570 7590 08/10/2005

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P.
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1764

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,238

Applicant(s)

IKEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Tam M. Nguyen

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2002.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

Art Unit: 1764

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Molstedt (3,409,542).

Molstedt discloses a process of discharging and transferring upwardly fluidized particles from a dense fluidized layer forming section to an upper section having a diameter that is smaller than the dense fluidized layer forming section, wherein an intermediate cylindrical section (cone) is provided between the dense fluidized forming section and the upper section. It is estimated that the diameter of the intermediate section is $1/3$ and $2/3$ times that of the dense fluidized layer forming section and the height of the intermediate section is 1 to 6 times a diameter thereof. Molstedt teaches that the intermediate section has truncated cone ends connected to the dense fluidized layer forming section and said upper section, respectively. The truncated cone end directly connected to the dense fluidized layer forming section has an elevation angle of 60° . Molstedt also discloses that the particles has an average size of from 40-100 microns (40-100 μm) and a gas superficial speed for fluidization within the dense bed is from 0.3 to 2 ft/sec (0.09 to .6 m/sec) and the velocity at the tapered zone is ranging of from 25 to 100 ft/sec. (7.6 to 30.5 m/sec.) See Figure, col. 3, line 8 through col. 4, line 9; and col. 5, lines 7-65.

It is noted that Molstedt does not specifically disclose that the intermediate section is a cylindrical section. However, it appears that the intermediated section (cone) of Molstedt is a special type of a cylindrical. Therefore, the limitation "cylindrical" is embraced by the reference.

Art Unit: 1764

Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Molstedt by using an intermediate cylindrical section as claimed because it would be expected that, in the process of Molstedt, the results would be the same or similar when using either the claimed intermediate section or the Molstedt section because both sections would result in increasing velocity of the gas as its proceeds upwardly.

Regarding claim 8, Molstedt does not disclose that the intermediated cylindrical section has an elevation of 85° or greater.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Molstedt by using an intermediated section with an elevation angle of 85° or greater because the gas velocity would be the same or similar when using either a shorter-pipe intermediated section with an elevation angle of about less than 85° or a longer-pipe intermediated section with an elevation angle of 85° or greater.

Response to Arguments

The argument that one would not be motivated based on Molstedt to utilize an intermediated section having a substantially cylindrical shape (emphases added) is not persuasive because the intermediated section of Molstedt has a cylindrical shape as claimed in claim 1.

The argument that maximum elevation angle taught by Molstedt is 60° and such a tapered cone would have too large a slope; that is, it would not meet the definition of a substantially cylindrical section is not persuasive. The present specification does not clearly define that a substantially cylindrical is a cylindrical which has an elevation angles of 85° or greater, but it is

Art Unit: 1764

disclosed that “the intermediated cylindrical section **may be** those whose lower portion has a larger diameter than the upper portion or whose elevation angle is 85° or greater” (emphasis added). Also, as discussed above, one of skill in the art would use an intermediated section with an elevation angle of 85° or greater because the gas velocity would be the same or similar when using either a shorter-pipe intermediated section with an elevation angle of about less than 85° or a longer-pipe intermediated section with an elevation angle of 85° or greater.

The argument that the results as described at page 13 of the specification, the apparatus comprising an intermediated section provide better results compared to the apparatus without an intermediated section is not persuasive because Molstedt teaches the intermediated section.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1764

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tam M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 1764

TN



8/8/05